UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,537	12/07/2000	Philip R. Graham	2705-0697	1789

73552 7590 07/09/2008

Stolowitz Ford Cowger LLP
621 SW Morrison St
Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205

EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN, BRANDON S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@stofoco.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/733,537	GRAHAM, PHILIP R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRANDON S. HOFFMAN	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 April 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *7,11-13,17,21-27 and 30-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7,11-13,17,21-27 and 30-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 7, 11-13, 17, 21-27, and 30-38 are pending in this office action, claims 32-38 are newly added.

2. Applicant's arguments, filed April 18, 2008, have been considered and are persuasive. However, a new ground of rejection is made.

Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this office action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 7, 11, 12, 21, 22, 24, 25, 30, 33, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,532) in view of Shwed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,726).

Regarding claim 7, Gupta et al. teaches a restricted data format method for a network infrastructure copy protection system, comprising:

- Receiving a digital content file for transmission across a distributed computer network (fig. 7, ref. num 702);

- Examining data comprising the content file, the examining performed within the distributed computer network (fig. 7, ref. num 704 and 706).

Gupta et al. does not teach to the examining is to determine whether the content file comprises a restricted data format, transmitting the content file when the data comprising the content file does not include the restricted data format, and blocking the transmission of the content file when the data comprising the content file does include the restricted data format to prevent unauthorized downloading of copyrighted material, wherein the blocking is effected prior to a transmission of the content file to a receiver.

Shwed et al. teaches examining the content file to determine whether the content file comprises a restricted data format (col. 1, lines 40-43), transmitting the content file when the data comprising the content file does not include the restricted data format and blocking the transmission of the content file when the data comprising the content file does include the restricted data format to prevent unauthorized downloading of copyrighted material, wherein the blocking is effected prior to a transmission of the content file to a receiver (col. 11, line 66 through col. 12, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine examining a content file for restricted data formats, and transmitting the content file if not restricted data formats exist and blocking transmitting of restricted data formats do exist, as taught by Shwed et al., to the restricted data

format method of Gupta et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because preventing certain data formats from being transmitted enables users to control what data are transmitted.

Regarding claims 11 and 24, the combination of Gupta et al. in view of Shwed et al. teaches the distributed computer network is the Internet (see col. 5, lines 15-20 of Gupta et al.).

Regarding claims 12 and 25, the combination of Gupta et al. in view of Shwed et al. teaches the examining is performed by a plurality of routers within the distributed computer network (see fig. 1, ref. num 104 of Gupta et al.).

Regarding claims 21, 30, and 33, Gupta et al. teaches a network device comprising:

- A bus (fig. 2a, ref. num 237);
- Computer readable memory units connected to said bus (col. 2a, ref. num 204);
- One or more processors coupled to said bus, said computer readable memory units for executing a digital signature method for a network infrastructure copy protection system (fig. 2a, ref. num 202), comprising:
    - Examining **a** digital content file to determine whether the digital content file includes **a** digital signature, wherein the examining is performed within a distributed computer network (col. 3, lines 50-54);

- Transmitting the digital content file when the digital content file includes the digital signature (col. 4, lines 7-11);
- Blocking transmission of the digital content file when the digital content file does not include the digital signature to prevent unauthorized downloading of copyrighted material (col. 4, lines 12 and 13)**; and**
- **Identifying a sender of the digital content file according to the digital signature included in the file transmission log after the digital content file has been transmitted** (col. 7, lines 11-27).

Gupta et al. does not teach **logging the digital content file and the digital signature to create a file transmission log**.

Shwed et al. teaches **logging the digital content file and the digital signature to create a file transmission log** (fig. 5, ref. num 532).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine logging the digital content file and the digital signature, as taught by Shwed et al., to the network device of Gupta et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because a log provides proof of previous actions.

Regarding claims 22 and 38, the combination of Gupta et al. in view of Shwed et al. teaches wherein the **file transmission log is configured to maintain a plurality of**

digital signatures associated with a single digital content file**, where each of the plurality of digital signatures is logged for a separate transmission of the digital content file** (see col. 7, lines 11-27 of Gupta et al.).

Claims 13, 17, 23, 26, 27, 31, 32, and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (USPN '532) in view of Shwed et al. (USPN '726), and further in view of Gibbs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,321).

Regarding claims 17, 27, and 31, Gupta et al. as modified by Shwed et al. teaches a method/system, comprising:

- Receiving a digital content file (see fig. 7, ref. num 702 of Gupta et al.);
- **Examining the digital content file for inclusion of a first digital signature** (see fig. 7, ref. num 704 of Gupta et al.)**;**
- **Verifying an authenticity of the first digital signature, wherein the first digital signature is associated with a first user** (see col. 17, lines 31-35 of Shwed et al.)**;**
- **Transmitting the digital content file including the first digital signature** (see fig. 18, ref. num 1810 of Shwed et al.)**;**
- **Receiving the digital content file** (see fig. 7, ref. num 702 of Gupta et al.)**;**
- **Examining the digital content file for inclusion of a second digital signature** (see fig. 19 of Shwed et al.)**;**

- **Verifying an authenticity of the second digital signature, wherein the second digital signature is associated with a second user** (see col. 17, lines 31-35 of Shwed et al.)**; and**
- **Transmitting the digital content file and the second digital signature** (see fig. 18, ref. num 1810 of Shwed et al.)**.**

The combination of Gupta et al. as modified by Shwed et al. does not teach **logging the digital content file and the first/second digital signature**. Gibbs et al. teaches **logging the digital content file and the first/second digital signatures** (fig. 4, ref. num 432, col. 6, lines 17-26, and col. 7, lines 56-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine logging the digital content and the digital signatures, as taught by Gibbs et al., to the restricted data format infrastructure/device/system of Gupta et al./Shwed et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because the steps above keep track of the status information and other information about the creation and authentication of digital signatures (see col. 3, lines 63-66 of Gibbs et al.).

Regarding claims 13 and 26, the combination of Gupta et al. in view of Shwed et al. teaches all the limitations of claims 7 and 21, respectively, above. However, the combination of Gupta et al. as modified by Shwed et al. does not teach the examining is performed by a plurality of cache engines within the distributed computer network.

Gibbs et al. teaches the examining is performed by a plurality of cache engines within the distributed computer network (fig. 4, ref. num 420 and col. 7, lines 13-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine a plurality of cache engines to perform the examining within the distributed computer network, as taught by Gibbs et al., to the method/network device of Gupta et al./Shwed et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because the use of a plurality of cache engines to perform examining within the distributed computer network allows faster examining of data as it is passed over the distributed computer network (see col. 7, lines 15-25 of Gibbs et al.).

Regarding claim 23, the combination of Gupta et al. in view of Shwed et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 21, above. However, the combination of Gupta et al. as modified by Shwed et al. does not teach wherein the digital signature applied to the content file within the distributed computer network is logged to maintain a record for the content file and the digital signature when the content file is transmitted across the distributed computer network.

Gibbs et al. teaches wherein the digital signature applied to the content file within the distributed computer network is logged to maintain a record for the content file and the digital signature when the content file is transmitted across the distributed computer network (fig. 4, ref. num 432, col. 6, lines 17-26 col. 7, lines 56-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the step of logging the digital signature applied to the content file when the content file is distributed, as taught by Gibbs et al., to the network device of Gupta et al./Shwed et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because the step of logging the digital signature applied to the content file when the content file is distributed keeps track of the status information and other information about the creation and authentication of digital signatures (see col. 3, lines 63-66 of Gibbs et al.).

Regarding claims 32 and 35, Gupta et al. as modified by Shwed et al./Gibbs et al. teaches further comprising means for identifying a plurality of senders that transmitted the digital content file across the distributed network, each of the plurality of senders associated with one or more of the plurality of digital signatures (see col. 7, lines 11-27 of Gupta et al.).

Regarding claim 34, Gupta et al. as modified by Shwed et al./Gibbs et al. teaches wherein the log is capable of maintaining a plurality of signatures associated with a single digital content file (see col. 7, lines 11-27 of Gupta et al.).

Regarding claim 36, Gupta et al. as modified by Shwed et al./Gibbs et al. teaches wherein a log is maintained of the digital content file and both of the corresponding first and second digital signatures (see col. 7, lines 11-27 of Gupta et al.).

Regarding claim 37, Gupta et al. as modified by Shwed et al./Gibbs et al. teaches further comprising identifying the first and second users from the first and second digital signatures maintained in the log (see col. 7, lines 11-27 of Gupta et al.).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON S. HOFFMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brandon S Hoffman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2136